

TERMS:  
TWO DOLLARS AND A HALF PER ANNUM,  
IN UNITED STATES CURRENCY.

RATES OF ADVERTISING.  
Advertisements inserted at the rate of One Dollar per square of twelve lines for the first insertion and Fifty Cents for each subsequent insertion. Liberal deductions made to those who advertise by the year.  
For announcing a candidate, Five Dollars in advance.

# The Anderson Intelligencer.

An Independent Family Journal--Devoted to Politics, Literature and General Intelligence.

VOL. 3.

ANDERSON, S. C., WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 8, 1868.

NO. 29.

Having recently made considerable additions to this department, we are prepared to execute

JOB WORK OF ALL KINDS

In the neatest style and on the most reasonable terms. Legal Blanks, Bill Heads, Posters, Cards, Handbills, Pamphlets, Labels, and in fact every style of work usually done in a country Printing Office.

In all cases, the money will be required upon delivery of the work. Orders, accompanied with the cash, will receive prompt attention.

## A Few Words for Planters.

A question of absorbing interest and of great magnitude is pressing upon the attention of planters throughout the cotton States. It must be met and decided within the next few days. Upon an intelligent and practical solution of the difficulty which it involves depends not only the future prosperity of the planting interests, but also the much more important and vital question of the ability of the planter to work his lands and make a bare support for his family. This great issue, which is being pressed home upon our planting friends, is the question whether they can afford to cultivate cotton at the present and prospective prices. And this involves another question which is equally important, while it is much more difficult of satisfactory solution;—it is the inquiry as to what crops shall be raised in lieu of cotton if it should be found that the price of the latter has fallen below the cost of its production.

We do not hesitate to declare what the experience of nineteen-twentieths of our planters proves to be true, that the price of upland cotton has fallen much below the cost of its production. It would be ruinous, nay criminal, folly for our planters to continue its production with the rates of labor and other necessary supplies as high as they have ruled the past year. This is simply out of the question. But the chief inquiry should be, what prices can be paid for labor with a fair prospect of making a reasonable profit on the capital and labor employed, with the present rates for cotton. If it should be found impossible to allow the freedmen a sum sufficient for his support and that of his family, to secure for the planter a fair return for his capital, then necessity will force the cotton planter to abandon the cultivation of this crop, and turn his attention to others which may offer to fulfill the above requirements. Upon the first part of the inquiry we have no hesitation in saying that cotton cannot be raised profitably at ten cents a pound in currency, if the labor which produces it is paid more than a bare and scanty support, leaving out of the calculation the cost of providing for the old and diseased—the women and children—who do not contribute to its cultivation. An average of four bales to the hand is a full crop with good seasons, and much more than is realized on most of the lands in the State. These four bales, if they net ten cents in market, will bring \$200. The cost of producing them, allowing that corn and forage will be made equal to the amount consumed, will be \$160, as follows:—For provisions and laborers \$70; tools \$20; and for rent of twenty-three acres of land \$70.

We believe the actual cost of production will be even more than is indicated in the above figures, and we have made no charge for overseer's wages, which is usually estimated at from \$15 to \$20 per hand. We have also omitted the item of taxes—Federal, State and county—which alone amounts to a considerable sum. If these figures present a fair exhibit of the cost of cotton raising, there can be no doubt that a continuation of its cultivation at present prices will very soon bankrupt all those not already in that condition. The only question which admits of argument, is whether the price of cotton will advance sufficiently in the course of the next year to make its production remunerative. We do not believe that it will. At all events it would be extremely hazardous to plant a crop, with the expectation of making it profitable by the hoped for advance in value. The only true basis upon which to predicate a sound and reliable calculation is that of the present market price. It is true, cotton may advance;—it is equally true that there is no reasonable grounds at the present for the belief that it will. Again, it is argued by some that the present tax of 2 cents per lb. will be repealed. We are not of the number who believe that there is much probability of such repeal; but even if it should be done, we hardly think that the price realized by the planters will advance to the extent of the tax thus removed. At best such a result is extremely doubtful, and ought not to be relied on with any degree of certainty.

If the foregoing views are, in the main, correct, it is quite apparent that planters should not attempt to raise anything like a full crop next year. But say some of our planting friends: "what are we to do with our lands and stock if we cease to grow cotton? we are obliged to do something for a living." To this we reply that, according to our calculations, the more cotton you plant, the more labor you employ, the more land you cultivate, will only increase your expenses without adding a single cent to your ability for supporting your families. We would suggest the planting of full crops of grain—corn, wheat, rye and oats—and the cultivation to a much larger extent than heretofore, of peas, potatoes, turnips, and all kinds of provision crops. But no one should attempt to plant larger crops than his corn and provisions on hand will enable him to cultivate without purchasing at the present high prices. Contract your crops so as to correspond with the size of your corn crib. It is a ruinous thing to buy corn. Be sure that you keep no more work animals than you can feed well without purchasing Northern or Western corn. It will be much better to permit a portion of your lands to "lie out" than to cultivate them at a cost greater than the value of their productions. If you only plant half of your usual crop, the lands which are left uncultivated will improve in productiveness, and, in that way, by alternately cropping and resting, you may save a large outlay now made for manures.

After making allowance for a bountiful supply of provisions, a few acres might

very well be planted in cotton; but in no event not more than will make enough, with fair seasons, to pay for the hire of labor. Cotton always commands cash—is much easier got to market than grain, and to it we should mainly look for the funds necessary to pay for the few laborers the cultivation of provision crops require. We believe that, as a general rule, our planters should not employ more than one-half the number of hands they had the present year. In some cases even a fewer number would be better. To these not more than one-third of the present wages ought to be allowed. We learn that in Southwestern Georgia, and in Alabama, planters are only giving five dollars per month for hands which last year they gave from fifteen to eighteen. In view of the great fall in the price of cotton, we believe that this is a fair and even a full price. We know that the planters have this matter of regulating the price of labor in their own hands. If they determine to curtail the cultivation of cotton they can greatly reduce the number of laborers which they will require. This alone would enable them to dictate prices. The price of labor will be, to some extent, controlled by the demand for it. Last year the supply was hardly equal to the demand, and the price was kept up so high as to make it unremunerative to those who employed it. We predict that there will never again be seen in this State the disgraceful scrambling and running after negroes as was witnessed the first of this year. Instead of capital courting and cajoling labor, it will be in the same condition here as it is all over the world—with labor begging and imploring for employment. Let the planter act firmly but kindly toward the poor negro. He should explain to him the real causes of the utter prostration of our agricultural interests, and show to him that the cotton planter is not responsible for the present state of affairs. He should cite to him the unjust exactions of the Federal Government in levying a tax equal to one-fourth of the value of cotton in order that the planter may be punished for participation in the late war. When the causes of our present stagnation and ruin are explained, the negro will see who is his best friend. He will then learn why it is that "old massa" can only afford to give him for next year's labor one-third or one-half of what he gets the present year.—*Chronicle and Sentinel, 27th ult.*

A CASE OF JEALOUSY.—The Selma Messenger has a very amusing account of the result of jealousy. A Selma merchant, Smith, whose business occupied the greater part of his attention, has a wife who suspected the causes of his absence from home during the evening hours. One night, whilst the husband met with some delay on his way to supper, a telegraphic message from a correspondent in Montgomery was left at home for him, couched as follows: "Meet Gertrude to-night." Controlling her emotions when her husband came in, the sobbing woman laid the dispatch on his plate. He came in, read it, and said he "would have to go to town after supper, and might not be back till late; she need not sit up for him." He hurried through his meal, took his hat and walked down the street. Before he had turned the corner his wife was following him swiftly and noiselessly. He went straight on, she close behind, until he reached the wharf. After an apparent inspection of the surroundings, he entered the office of the wharf-boat. His wife took a position where she could see him through the glass door, and waited for the final— which was expected in the shape of the Gertrude whom her faithless spouse was to meet. Time dragged on heavily, and the lady became drowsy and at last fell in a doze, from which she was aroused by the shrill whistle of an approaching steamer. Nearer and nearer she came, and as she rounded to, the name of "Gertrude," in large, brightly painted letters, met the view of the jealous wife, and a stentorian voice, inquiring if Smith was on hand, completed her awakening.

At a glance the position was realized, and the poor woman could have cried for vexation as she saw her husband and another gentleman hurriedly transacting some business within a few feet of her. At that moment a tipsy negro came stumbling along, and, seeing a woman's dress half hidden among the bales and boxes of merchandise, seized her, exclaiming, "come out ob dar, ole gal." Her scream of terror brought her husband to the scene, whose astonishment may be imagined. She fell into his arms with a hysterical burst of sobs, and explanations ensued. The party returned to their home in a hack, and somebody's head was on somebody's bosom all the way. Since that time, all that Smith has to do to avert a scolding is to insinuate that he will "meet Gertrude."

THE BRAVE WIFE OF AN IGNORANT HUSBAND.—Some weeks ago Fred Douglas, the famous nigger, made a speech in West Chester, Pennsylvania, to a mob of blacks and others. Previous to his arrival, Hon. John Hickman, a member elect to the Assembly, invited the sable orator to make him a visit, and consider his house a home during his stay, which invitation Fred duly accepted. Hickman at once put his best chamber in order and made extensive preparations for his guest, in spite of all that his wife could do or say. But she bided her time. A woman, especially when she is in the right, is never without her resources. So, when the great Douglas was announced, and with hat in hand, was making his most elaborate bow, she met him at the parlor door and peremptorily ordered him out of the house. He did not "stand upon the order of his going, but went at once!" Long may Mrs. Hickman rule, the mistress of her house; and, in the good time coming, when women get their

"rights," may she be sent to the Assembly by the voters of West Chester in the place of her unworthy husband. Bully for Mrs. Hickman!—*Southern Opinion.*

## History of the Confederate Flag.

The lowered banner of the Stars and Bars is furled forever, no longer the symbol of a struggling people, nor as we had one day hoped to look upon it—the flag of a nation—the Confederate States of America—free and independent. But our flag has a history, and the time has come when to preserve that history from oblivion some record should be made of it.

The author of the new design adopted by the Confederate Congress was Major A. L. Rogers, Confederate States Artillery, who, while disabled from active service in the field, devoted some of his leisure hours to improve the national emblem. After much attention to the subject, and the laws of heraldry, Major Rogers, in January, 1865, submitted his design to Congress; and on the 13th of that month, Mr. Semmes, of Louisiana, submitted the following bill in the Senate:

"A BILL TO ESTABLISH THE FLAG OF THE CONFEDERATE STATES."

"The Congress of the Confederate States of America do enact. That the flag of the Confederate States shall be as follows: The width two-thirds of its length, with the union (now used as the battle flag) to be in width three-fifths of the width of the flag, and so proportioned as to leave the length of the field on the side of the union twice the width of the field below it; to have the ground red, and in blue saltier thereon, bordered with white and emblazoned with mullets or five pointed stars, corresponding in number to that of the Confederate States; the field to be white except the outer half from the union to be a red bar extending the width of the flag."

Before offering the bill, Mr. Semmes addressed a letter to General Lee, commanding the army of Northern Virginia, and requested his views on the proposed alteration. General Lee replied that he thought it "very pretty and" that it "certainly added distinctness to the flag," but, with his usual modesty, said he mistrusted his own judgment in such matters, and that the Naval Committee were the proper gentlemen to be consulted. The bill was accordingly referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs, and after various plans had been submitted, and the opinions of leading officers of the navy obtained, said committee unanimously recommended its adoption.

Among the distinguished Confederate officers who approved the design of Major Rogers, and recommended his proposed alteration in the national symbol of the Confederate States, were General J. E. Johnston, General S. Cooper, Lieutenant General Ewell, Lieutenant General Longstreet's Inspector General, Major Generals Fitz Lee, Houser and Lomax of cavalry; Brigadier Generals Pendleton and Long of artillery; Major General Heth, Major General Smith, Governor of Virginia; Major General Smith, Superintendent of the Virginia Military Institute; Captain N. W. Barker, Acting Chief of Signal Bureau; Captain Willborn, of Signal Corps; Brigadier General Wharton, Colonel J. S. Mosby, and many other distinguished officers of the army.

As descriptive of the flag, we subjoin some extracts from a letter of Major Rogers, addressed to Hon. Edward Sparrow, Chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs, Confederate States Senate: "The portion of the flag proposed to be changed to a red bar is the part, too, most rapidly defaced. It is strongly urged by naval officers of high standing, that our flag is liable to be mistaken for a flag of truce, particularly in a calm, when it hangs dead against the mast and the union is obscured by the white bunting. When seen at a distance, flags are generally displayed against the white clouds beyond, and hence want of distinctness is a great defect in the present flag, the union being the only portion seen."

"The battle flag selected by General Johnston and recommended by himself and General Beauregard, under which so much blood has been spilled in our struggle for independence, is fully displayed as the union of the proposed flag, which can only be done by surrounding it with white, and the white bar, forming the outer half of the field from the union, is suggested as the best design for its improvement. I am opposed to all stripes, many or few, red or blue. Instead of 'the stars and stripes,' let us have 'The Stars and Bars.' The colors of the new flag would be chiefly white and red, with as little as possible of the Yankee blue."

"The heraldic significance of these colors is deemed especially appropriate for the Confederate States—the white (argent) being emblematic of purity and innocence, and the red (gules) of fortitude and courage. In the adoption of ensigns by various nations of the world, it is noticed by Captain Hamilton, in the history of the United States flag, that they generally imitate the ensigns of the nations from which they sprang. This rule is complied with in the flag as proposed, for our people are chiefly descended from the British and the French, and we get the union and cross of St. Andrew from the former, and the bar from the flag of the latter nation, while the idea of having stars to represent the States respectively is taken from the flags of the old Union, mainly founded by our forefathers. The new flag is easily made, and is without the completion of any painting which, besides the difficulty of correct execution, soon rots the bunting. The proportions, while most pleasing to the eye, possess the virtue of simplicity—the white below and on side of the union being the same width as the red bar. They have been approved by some of the best artists in the Confederacy, and after a careful examination,

have been pronounced correct by some of the most experienced officers of the navy, such as Commodore Forrest, Captain Raphael Semmes, Captain S. S. Lee, Captain Mason and Captain W. H. Parker, the latter having been at the head of the Confederate States Naval Academy."

The bill adopting the new design passed branches of Congress—the Senate unanimously—and was signed by President Davis, February 22d, 1865, thus becoming a law on the birthday of the great Virginian, George Washington, and the anniversary of the day that gave birth to the permanent government of the Confederate States.

All signs, omens and coincidents seemed to foretell the speedy success of the young Confederacy and its new symbol so auspiciously unfurled, and doomed to be quenched and lost on the night of disaster that came before the eyes of April of that same ill-fated year.

Major Rogers, whose name is inseparably associated with the Confederate flag as its author, is a native of Loudon county, Virginia. At the inception of the war he raised a company of artillery from his native section, which command was honorably mentioned by General Beauregard in his report of the first battle of Manassas. He was re-elected Captain, promoted for gallant and meritorious conduct at the second battle of Manassas, and was attached to the staff of General Stonewall Jackson. At the battle of Chancellorsville, Major Rogers was among the members of General Jackson's staff who were struck down with him on the occasion when Jackson received his death-wound. When, in 1865, Major Rogers conceived the new design of the flag, he was stationed at Chaffin's Bluff, on the James, in command of that defense. General Lee, in a letter to General S. Cooper, Adjutant-General, recommending Major Rogers for post service, because of his wound, thus speaks of him:

"He is a gallant officer, and if there is any duty he can perform at the stationary batteries in or around Richmond, or in the camps of instruction, I recommend that he be assigned to it."

Thus we have given a brief history of the Confederate flag, coupling with it the name of its author, who signified his taste and genius in the design of a flag intended to symbolize the noble cause for which the South so gallantly contended.—*Southern Opinion.*

## On Cotton.

The National Intelligencer contains the following article on cotton:

Mr. Sprague, of Rhode Island, rarely obtrudes himself upon the Senate; but his remarks of Friday last on the repeal of the cotton tax, were more weighty and worthy of consideration than nine-tenths of the platitudes which the dominant party in that body prefer to inflict upon the country. He invoked attention to the prostrate condition of American industry, and more especially of the great staple, cotton, now being destroyed by the unwise legislation of Congress. Mr. Sprague is, as all know, a large manufacturer, and he is, also, a large cotton planter. He ought, therefore, to be master of his subject. A statement from him, that the British manufacturers were now able, by their skillful labor and machinery, to produce from the short, dry and once despised staple of India cotton a product equal to that obtained by us from the American staple, must have been startling to hearers unwilling to learn any other lesson than that of an insensate hate. Mr. Sprague told them that he feared they had lost this great interest forever; that the control of the question had passed from their hands. He even feared the competition of India cotton in American markets. As for Sea Island cotton, he believed that in two years it would only be produced as a rare plant in some gentleman's garden. At this day Egyptian cotton was used in seven-eighths of the articles in which Sea Island cotton was formerly employed. The plantations of the South were not worth the twentieth part of what they were before the war. After these statements, Mr. Sprague might as well assert that while England conquered territory for the purpose of producing cotton, the dominant party had conquered territory merely to destroy it.

Such is the *expose* of a practical man and a representative of the industrial interest of the country on the floor of the Senate. If it had been made in a British House of Commons, or had been delivered even a few years ago in the American Senate, such an appeal would have excited profound attention. But what is the destruction of a great national industry to the Radical party immersed in schemes of President making? Their cry is, perish commerce, perish manufactures, perish cotton, perish the poor negro, who depends on this last industry for his daily bread, rather than sacrifice on Jot or tittle of the revenge by which this party proposes to perpetuate its power. But while these truths may fall on closed ears in the Senate, they will not pass unheeded by the great business and mercantile classes of the country. These, and all thinking and patriotic men will inquire what party is responsible for this state of things, and they will see that the expulsion of these bad men from power is the first step towards relieving the public distress.

## General Grant the Father of the Reconstruction Scheme.

This assertion may surprise our readers, as the fact certainly surprises us; but it is, nevertheless, a fact. The evidence of it has just been furnished by General Grant himself.

Among the papers which General Grant sent to the House of Representatives on Tuesday, according to the telegraph, was the following recommendation, being an endorsement on a letter of General Sheridan's:

Respectfully forwarded to the Secretary of War.

Attention is invited to that portion of the within communication which refers to the condition of the Union men and freedmen in Texas, and to the powerlessness of the military in the present state of affairs to afford them protection. Even the effect of the presence of the troops is passing away. A few days ago a squad of soldiers on duty was fired on by citizens in Brownsville. In my opinion, the great number of murders of Union and freedmen in Texas (which are not only unpunished but uninvestigated) constitutes practically a state of insurrection; and, believing it to be the province and duty of every good government to afford protection to the lives, liberty, and property of her citizens, I would recommend the declaration of martial law in Texas.

To secure these the necessity for governing any portion of our territory by martial law is to be deplored. If resorted to, it should be limited in its authority, and should leave all local authorities and civil tribunals free and unobstructed until they prove recreant to their duties. Martial law would give security, or comparatively so, to all classes of citizens, without regard to race, color, or political opinions, and should be continued until society is capable of protecting itself, or until the State is restored to its full relation to the Union. The application of martial law in one of these States would be a warning to all, and, if necessary, can be extended to others.

Signed, U. S. GRANT.  
January 29, 1867.

This recommendation, be it observed, was made on the 29th of January in the current year. It embraces five leading points. 1. The assumption that no adequate protection for life or property existed in Texas. 2. The avowal that it was necessary that peace and good order should be enforced in Texas until a loyal and republican state government could be legally established. 3. The advice that until then Texas should be made subject to the military authority of the United States. 4. The suggestion that it might become proper likewise to subject all the rest of the so-called rebel States to the same authority. 5. The necessary implication that no legal State government existed in any of those States. Such are the views which General Grant officially communicated to the Secretary of War on the 29th day of January in this year. Mark the sequel.

On the 6th of February, only a week afterwards, Mr. Thaddeus Stevens, from the Joint Committee on Reconstruction, reported a reconstruction bill, which, after some modification, was passed on the 2d of March over the President's veto. This is the fundamental act of the reconstruction scheme; and, for the purpose of enabling our readers to compare the scheme with what General Grant had recommended a month before the act was adopted, we here give the preamble and the first section of the act:

WHEREAS, No legal State governments or adequate protection for life or property now exist in the rebel States of Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Mississippi, Alabama, Louisiana, Florida, Texas and Arkansas; and whereas, it is necessary that peace and good order should be enforced in said States until loyal and republican State governments can be legally established: Therefore,

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That said rebel States shall be divided into military districts and made subject to military authority of the United States as herein after prescribed, and for that purpose Virginia shall constitute the first district; North Carolina and South Carolina the second district; Georgia, Alabama and Florida the third district; Mississippi and Arkansas the fourth district; and Louisiana and Texas the fifth district.

Herein is embodied every one of the points embraced in General Grant's recommendation; and no other point. The act is a mere embodiment of the views which General Grant a month before had communicated to the Secretary of War. If any reader doubts this, let him carefully compare the two. It is a case of simple inspection. And there never was a plainer one! The identity is manifest. It is complete. No discerning man can compare the reconstruction act with General Grant's previous recommendation to Secretary Stanton, and honestly deny that the act is merely a legislative elaboration of the recommendation. General Grant undeniably stands confessed as the father of the reconstruction scheme.

On this development comment is unnecessary. The development speaks for itself. General Grant belongs to the radicals. Their title to him is clear and unquestionable. Let them take him. They are welcome to him. Among the letters which accompany the extraordinary endorsement under notice, we observe, is one in which General Grant undertook to set before the President the awful consequences of removing Sheridan and Stanton, or either of them. The letter and the endorsement together very effectually put an end to General Grant's political importance. The one shows that his political principles are utterly unsound; and the other shows that he is as deficient in po-

litical sense as he is in political soundness. We for some time have suspected as much.

The fact is, the truth concerning General Grant has been too long unspoken. He is a stupendous humbug. And the sooner the Conservatives recognize the fact, and act upon it, the better for themselves and for the country. Any further persistence in the opposite course would be suicidal stupidity.

If we are going to dice with the Radicals, let us not load their die. Let us rather take out the load which, by some inexplicable fatuity, we have already put in it. For our own part, we confess that we are more disgusted with Gen. Grant than we have ever been before with any public man of any party. There is a meanness in his mouthing for the Presidency which is inexpressibly sickening.—*Louisville Journal.*

## The Convention Ordered.

The following order has been issued from the Headquarters of this Military District: *General Orders No. 160.*

At the election held in the State of South Carolina, on the 19th and 20th days of November, pursuant to General Orders No. 99, from these Headquarters, dated October 10, 1867, a majority of the registered voters of the said State having voted on the question of holding a convention, and a majority of the votes cast being in favor of holding such convention, the delegates elected thereto, and hereinafter named, are hereby notified, in conformity with the provisions of the fourth section of the act of Congress of March 23, 1867, to assemble in convention in the City of Charleston, South Carolina, at noon on Tuesday, the 14th day of January, 1868, for the purpose of framing a constitution and civil government according to the provisions of the aforesaid act of the 23d day of March, 1867, and of the act of the 2d day of March, 1867, to which it is supplementary.

## DELEGATES:

Abbeville—Hutton J. Lomax, Nelson Joiner, John A. Hunter, Bailey Milford, Thomas Williamson.  
Anderson—William Perry, Dr. N. J. Newell, Samuel Johnson.  
Barnwell—Charles P. Leslie, Niles G. Parker, James N. Hayne, Julius Mayer, Charles D. Hayne, Abraham Middleton.  
Berkeley—Joseph H. Jenks, W. H. W. Gray, Geo. Lee, A. C. Richmond, D. H. Chamberlain, William Jervey, Timothy Hurley, M. F. Becker, Benjamin Byas.  
Beaufort—Francis E. Wilder, James D. Bell, Robert Smalls, J. J. Wright, R. G. Holmes, W. J. Whipper, L. S. Langley.  
Charleston—A. G. Mackey, F. A. Sawyer, A. J. Ransier, Wm. McKinlay, Robt. C. Delarge, Francis L. Carzoda, Gilbert Pillsbury, C. C. Bowen, Richard H. Cain.  
Chester—S. Sanders, P. Alexander, B. Burton.

Clarendon—Elias Dickson, Wm. Nelson.  
Columbia—Wm. M. Thomas, J. K. Terry, Wm. Driffler, W. M. Viney, Jesse S. Craig.  
Chesterfield—R. J. Donaldson, H. L. Shrewsbury, Isaac Brokenton, Richard Humbird.  
Edgefield—R. B. Elliott, George DeMeddis, John Woolley, Prince R. Rivers, John Bouam, David Harris, Frank Arnam.  
Fairfield—Henry Jacobs, James M. Rutland, H. D. Edwards.  
Georgetown—Franklin F. Miller, Henry W. Webb, Joseph H. Rainey.  
Greenville—Wm. B. Johnson, James M. Allen, James M. Ramon, Wilson Cook.  
Horry—Stephen H. Thompson, Henry Jones.  
Kershaw—J. K. Jillson, S. G. Dill, John A. Chestnut.  
Lexington—Lemuel Boozer, S. Corley.  
Lawson—Albert Clinton, Chas. Jones.  
Lawrence—Nelson Davis, Joseph Crews, Harry McDaniel, Y. J. P. Owens.  
Marbleboro—Calvin Stubbs, Geo. Jackson.  
Marion—Wm. S. Collins, H. E. Haynes, Benj. A. Tompson, J. W. Johnson.  
Newberry—Lee Nance, B. Odell Duncan, James Henderson.

Orangeburg—F. J. Cain, E. W. M. Mackey, Benj. F. Randolph, T. K. Sasportas, W. J. McKinley.  
Pickens—Alexander Bryce, M. Mauldin, Dr. L. B. Johnson.  
Richland—Wm. E. Nash, Chas. M. Wilder, Sam'l B. Thompson, Thos. J. Robertson.  
Spartanburg—John S. Gentry, J. P. F. Camp, Rice Foster, Coy Wingo.  
Sumter—T. J. Cogblan, W. B. Johnson, Samuel Lee, F. J. Moses Jr.  
Union—Abram Dogan, Samuel Nuckles, Jas. H. Coss.

Williamsburg—C. M. Olsen, S. A. Swalls, William Darrington.  
York—W. E. Rose, Dr. J. C. Neagle, J. H. White, John W. Mead.

## AN INDEPENDENT FAMILY.—The Camden Journal says:

A friend of ours, with whom we spent a couple of nights a few weeks ago, with the aid of his two sons, one scarcely large enough to plough, made this year three bales of cotton, upwards of four hundred bushels of corn, one hundred bushels of peas, two hundred bushels of sweet potatoes, besides Irish potatoes, pinders &c., and had thirteen hogs ready for the knife; which would net him 2,000 to 2,300 pounds of pork, with flour enough to serve him until harvesting his next crop of wheat, of which he has planted largely. His crop was all harvested and housed, his lots and stables well filled with litter, and the boys were taking holiday after their year's work.

His wife and one daughter, attend to all the household and domestic affairs, and clothe (handsomely) the family, consisting of eight, from wool raised on the plantation. Our friend lives in the "Sand Hills," and plants sandy land, but since "freedom," has adopted the system of planting the richest portions, leaving the other to rest and recuperate. Is such a family dependent upon Cuffy?